

III. REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

A. Remarks.

The disclosure has been objected to because of the presence of imbedded hyperlinks. Claims 1 through 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, on the basis that these claims are indefinite and purportedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More specifically it was asserted that use of the terms “a drive shaft”, “the drive shaft”, and “said drive shaft” in claims 1 and 6, as well as other terms in claims 5 and 15 makes the claims unclear as pointed out by the Examiner. Claims 4, 7, 13 and 14 were further objected to as being in improper form.

It is noted that the Examiner made no rejection based upon the prior art, but cited a number of references as teaching “related transmission structure” and, therefore, “pertinent to applicant’s disclosure”.

B. Response

1. Objection to The Disclosure

The disclosure has been objected to because of the presence of imbedded hyperlinks. A request to amend the specification is contained herein whereby all hyperlinks have been removed. Applicant therefore requests that the objection to the specification on the basis of the embedded hyperlinks be removed.

2. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 through 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, on the basis that these claims are indefinite and purportedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. With regard to the objection of claims

1 and 6 asserting that it was unclear which drive shaft the applicant was referring to, it is respectfully pointed out that claims 1 and 6 as originally filed recite a drive shaft, which is referred to as element 6 in the description portion of the application, and a driven gear shaft, which has been labeled element 11 in the description. Accordingly it should now be clear to the Examiner that a drive shaft and a driven gear shaft are referred to in these claims and are distinct elements.

Concerning the optional stand off assembly of claims 1 and 6, these claims have been amended to remove this optional element and thus more clearly define the invention under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and to remove the Examiner's objections as to form. Claim 15 was objected to on the basis that it was unclear how a transmission would be altered as necessary for the collection of semen. Claim 15 has been canceled without prejudice with this response.

For the reasons stated above in response to the rejection under the first paragraph of this section, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1 – 15 under this section be reconsidered and withdrawn.

3. Objections to Claims 4, 7, 13, and 14 Under 37 CFR 1.75(c)

Claims 4, 7, 13, and 14 stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claims 4, 7, 13, and 14 have been amended to contain the stand-off element, which was removed from claims 1 and 6. Accordingly, claims 4, 7, 13, and 14 now recite structure different from that recited in independent claims 1 and 6 from which these claims depend.

4. Objection to the Drawings

The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for not containing every feature of the

invention specified in the claims. More specifically, it was indicated that the “altered as necessary” as claimed in claim 15 was missing from the drawings. Claim 15 is being canceled without prejudice with this paper; accordingly corrected drawings are no longer necessary and it is requested that this objection be withdrawn.

C. Discussion of Cited References

References were cited in the Office Action mailed July 1, 2004 that were not otherwise referenced in the body of the action nor relied on as a basis for the rejection of any of the applicant’s claims. Those references are U.S Patent No. 6,632,185 issued to Chen, U.S. Patent No. 2,081,796 issued to Delvin, U.S. Patent No. 5,676,796 issued to Kim, and U.S. Patent No. 4,089,229 issued to Geraci. These patents do not add information to issues already raised and discussed, and as such do not affect the patentability of the claims of the subject application.

IV. CONCLUSION

It is respectfully urged that in light of the above stated amendments and submissions that the claims of the above referenced application are in compliance with the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. It is believed that the foregoing response is full and complete. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the instant application in light of the foregoing response and amendments.

Should the Examiner have any questions, comments or suggestions in furtherance of the prosecution of the application, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant’s representative by telephone or fax.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

Oct 29 2004

By:

Kenneth E. Kuffner

Kenneth E. Kuffner
Registration No. 24,508

KUFFNER & ASSOCIATES

2476 Bolsover St., #534

Houston, Texas 77005

(832) 418-0321

(713) 963-9171-facsimile

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT